



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,070	02/12/2002	Rajesh Kumar Varma	GLS-021	6677
7590	08/25/2004			EXAMINER MULLIS, JEFFREY C
Alfred D. Lobo, Esq., LOBO & CO., L.P.A. 933 The Leader Bulding 526 Superior Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114-1401			ART UNIT 1711	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/074,070	VARMA, RAJESH KUMAR
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,10,16,18,19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 7-9,11,13-15,17,20 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

The finality of the FINAL Office action is hereby withdrawn. All previous rejections/objections are hereby withdrawn.

Applicants newly resubmitted declaration has been reviewed. However, only the issue of new matter is pertinent to any issue present prior to submission of applicants last response. With regard to the issue of new matter, an overall view of applicants specification, including the ranges cited therein and Examples would lead those skilled in the art to conclude that applicants' table was an an error and that applicants correction was the most likely correct value. Hence the explicit disclosure of the specification as filed is sufficient to support the correction. With regard to applicants' declaration, however, the corrections made by applicants to the table pertain to specific examples to which only a single value of oxygen permeability is associated based on the principle of inherency and applicants' declaration indicating that the amendments to the table reflect the correct values are also sufficient to indicate support for the corrections.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 16, 18, 19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over St. Clair et al. (US 4,783,504).

Note page 6, lines 31-33 where it is disclosed that patentees' examples exhibit shore A hardnesses of 15-50 and Table 2 for use of Kraton block copolymers and Indopol H-300, a polybutene disclosed useful by applicants' specification. As the materials of applicants and patentees' are identical, identical characteristics are presumed inherent.

When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the Examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, basis exists for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. Note In re Fitzgerald et al. 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596, (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 16, 18, 19 and 22-24 are *rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Raimondi et al..

Note the use of applicants' polybutenes at column 2, lines 41-46 having applicants molecular weights in Table II. Note the use of Kraton block copolymers with said polybutenes in Tables III and IV and having Shore Hardness values of 40-46. As applicants' and patentees' materials are the same, identical characteristics are assumed inherent.

When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the Examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, basis exists for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. Note In re Fitzgerald et al. 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596, (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raimondi et al. or St. Clair et al, cited above.

The thickness of claim 2 is not disclosed. However, Choice of applicants' thicknesses would have been obvious to a practitioner having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in that it requires only routine skill to find the optimal or workable range of a result effective variable absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results.

Claims 7-9 ,11, 13-15, 17, 20, 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

This Office action is not being made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
J Mullis
Art Unit 1711

